

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2148

TAO OF SYSTEMS INTEGRATION, INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ANALYTICAL SERVICES & MATERIALS, INCORPORATED;
JALALIAH UNNAM; VENKI SUBBIAH VENKAT, formerly
known as Subbiah Venkateswaran,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SIVA MANGALAM,

Defendant.

No. 04-2149

TAO OF SYSTEMS INTEGRATION, INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

and

SIVA MANGALAM,

Counter Defendant - Appellee,

versus

ANALYTICAL SERVICES & MATERIALS, INCORPORATED;
JALALIAH UNNAM; VENKI SUBBIAH VENKAT, formerly
known as Subbiah Venkateswaran,

Defendants - Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith,
District Judge. (CA-03-67-4)

Argued: May 25, 2005

Decided: August 5, 2005

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ARGUED: Gregory Neil Stillman, HUNTON & WILLIAMS, Norfolk,
Virginia, for Appellant/Cross-Appellee. Alan Dale Albert, David
Kegebein Sutelan, LECLAIR RYAN, P.C., Norfolk, Virginia, for
Appellees/Cross-Appellants. **ON BRIEF:** Brent L. VanNorman, HUNTON
& WILLIAMS, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant/Cross-Appellee.
George H. Bowles, TROUTMAN SANDERS, L.L.P., Virginia Beach,
Virginia, for Appellees/Cross-Appellants.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

This case stems from a dispute arising from a series of bids by rival engineering firms seeking to provide services to NASA. Tao of Systems Integration, Inc., appeals from the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Analytical Services and Materials, Inc. (ASM) on Tao's Lanham Act claim. ASM appeals from the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Tao on ASM's trade secrets misappropriation claim and from the district court's refusal to grant summary judgment in favor of ASM on Tao's trade secrets misappropriation claim. We have reviewed the record and considered the parties' arguments and find them to be meritless. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. (J.A. at 3136-61.)

AFFIRMED